

REMARKS

Claim 71 calls for customizing content for a selection graphical user interface, said customization based on (1) the current user of the processor-based system, (2) the current user's recorded user input, and (3) the products or services of a particular retail vendor.

Claim 71 is rejected based on Rangan in view of BISYS. Neither reference, nor their combination, teaches using all three criteria set forth above to customize content. For example, Rangan does not customize based on the current user's recorded user inputs or the products or services of a particular retail vendor. BISYS does no customization whatsoever.

There is no suggestion within the prior art of customizing based on the user's recorded user input or the products and services of the particular retail vendor. While the extended discussion on page 8 of the office action is noted, Rangan never thought of anything corresponding to what is claimed. BISYS has no customization whatsoever.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 71 would appear to be appropriate.

Claim 66 calls for preventing the identified customer from using the Internet services through the service provider without the customer first viewing in sequence at least three graphical user interfaces from said plurality. The point is to preclude application of the claim to merely set up screens and to cover the idea of enabling a user to use a portal provided by a retail vendor in return for the user viewing substantive screens from that retail vendor. Thus, the limitation to three interfaces precludes application of the claim to mere set up screens.

Claim 66 was rejected over the combination of BISYS and Rangan. However, neither reference singly, or in combination, teaches a system where the customer must view three sequential graphical user interfaces from the retail vendor in order to access the Internet. It is noted on page 5 of the office action that a login or sign in interface might be one of the three. But even if that is so, no reference teaches requiring two other sequential interfaces.

The argument is made that customizing the next interface with the user's preference is an inherent feature. It is not seen why this would be so. Moreover, if the next screen identifies the customer in response to the customer identifying himself that would be only two, not three, screens.

The argument that customizing based on preference being inherent, is clearly not the case. There is no requirement that this be done in the prior art and, even if it had been done for

years, as the Examiner suggests, this is 2007 and the application was filed in 2000. The assertion that something has been done for years is both unsupported and inadequate to meet the claimed limitations since it would have had to be done for seven years to meet the claimed limitations. No one has ever thought of the idea of requiring the user to view three screens in order to get to the Internet. Thus, the retail provider can get some advertising value or marketing value in return for providing Internet access.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 66 is respectfully requested.

Claim 81 calls for instructions that enable a machine to receive a plurality of graphical user interfaces on behalf of a particular retail vendor customized for the user "based on that user's activities."

Nothing of the sort is set forth in any of the cited references. Rangan and the material cited in column 7, lines 50-58, does talk about collecting information about what users do. But there is no indication that the individual user's portal would be customized based on what that individual user does. Clearly, the import of what is set forth in Rangan is that there are researchers who find out what users are doing and use that to change the portal for all users. There is no suggestion that there ought to be a way to customize the site for individual users. Nor is there a suggestion to do so using machine readable instructions without the need for facilitators (who are indicated to be persons to comb through the records of what lots of users have been looking at). Thus, the missing elements are using instructions to individualize the content for a specific user based on that user's activities.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 81 is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claim 83 is not understood. It does not appear that there is any suggestion of claim 83 in any of the cited references. The fact that Tobin reminds people about birthdays and other marketing information does not teach modified customized content for one identified user based on another identified user's preferences in past activities. There are no preferences in past activities of another user used to modify customized content for one user.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

With respect to the Section 112 rejection of claim 66, it is respectfully submitted that the claim construction applied is impermissible. Suppose there are ten user interfaces, only three of which meet the claimed limitation. That would still fall within the claim because the claim does not say that every user interface must meet the claimed limitations, but only that a plurality of

them do. Within that plurality they may each have certain characteristics. In other words, in the example given above, each of the three user interfaces would have that characteristic.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of claim 71, it is not understood why it is believed there is any need for any antecedent basis for the claimed limitation. It is a method claim and there is no reference to any method limitation in the objected to clause. To provide antecedent basis for electronic features in a method claim makes no sense because, to do so, you would have to be claiming non-method features, instead of claiming the method. Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

With respect to the last two lines of the first paragraph of claim 31, it was meant that the interface would be without content from retail inventors who are both other and unrelated retail vendors.

The phrase "said selection graphical user interface other than said activity graphical user interface and said sign in graphical user interfaces" is meant to refer to a selection graphical user interface that is different than the activity graphical user interface and the sign in graphical user interfaces.

With respect to the objection to claim 81, it is believed that claim 81 applies to the server. The server is illustrated in Figure 1. For example, the web server 18 may receive a user identifier from the client system 12 over the Internet 14. It may receive graphical user interfaces over the Internet 14 for the service provider 16. It may modify the customized content on the graphical user interface based on selections made by the client system 12 and received by the web server 18 over the Internet 14. Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 27, 2007



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]
Attorneys for Intel Corporation